

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed October 11, 2007. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 1-30 were previously pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-30 have been amended as detailed above. Claims 3, 6, 20, and 22 have been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-19, 21, and 23-30 remain pending in the present application.

Initially, the undersigned would like to thank examiner Hussain for discussing the present application on December 11, 2007. In particular, claims 1 and 6 were briefly discussed and no agreement was reached regarding allowability of the aforementioned claims over the cited art (Viswanath et al.). Also, objections to the drawings were discussed.

Since the amendments proposed herein are merely combining language from previously pending claims, it is respectfully submitted that no new search is required and the Office is respectfully requested to enter these amendments to allow the application to proceed to appeal.

#### Objection to Drawings

Per the telephonic interview on December 11, 2007, it is believed that reversal of amendments made to claims to replace discard\* with delet\* fully address any objection to the drawings.

#### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Viswanath et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,322).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed with examiner on December 11, 2007, the Office has failed to provide a prima facie case for anticipation of the pending claims. However, to put the application in a more proper form for appeal, without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claim

1 to include the language of canceled claims 3 and 6. Claim 19 has also been amended to include the language of claims 20 and 22. Claim 10 now also recites similar language.

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

In particular, the Office is respectfully reminded of the requirements of MPEP §2131 that states a “claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference” (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Moreover, as Viswanath clearly fails to teach (or even suggest) CRC related information (see, e.g., the previously filed response), claim 1 is in condition for allowance. As the Office relies on the same argument to reject claim 22, this claim should also be allowable, for at least similar reasons. Similar arguments (though not identical) apply to the remaining independent claim 10 and all pending independent claims should be allowable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

---

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (720-840-6740) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890**

**Telephone No. 720-840-6740**

Date Jan. 10, 2008

By /Ramin Aghevli/  
Ramin Aghevli  
Reg. No. 43,462